



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/836,075	04/21/1997	GEERT MAERTENS	INNS:004/KAM	5845

7590

03/01/2004

B. J. SADOFF  
NIXON & VANDERHYE P. C.  
1100 N. GLEBE ROAD  
8TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

ZEMAN, MARY K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/836,075

Applicant(s)

MAERTENS ET AL.

Examiner

Mary K Zeman

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 75-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 75-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1631

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 75-85 are pending in this application.

The amendment filed 1/6/04 has been entered and considered. Any rejection not reiterated below has been withdrawn.

Claims 75-85 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention for the reasons set forth in the previous office action.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. In regards to Applicant's citations of other patents in support of patentability, the Examiner cannot comment on prosecution in other applications. In regards to arguments regarding previously allowed claims, Applicant is reminded that the case was reopened for prosecution, and all applications are examined under present policy and guidelines. In regards to the arguments regarding the various guidelines in the specification for determining uniqueness, these limitations are not a part of the pending claims, and such limitations from the specification cannot be read into the claims. It is noted that Applicant has not responded to all of the issues in the rejection.

As set forth previously, the claims are drawn to polynucleotide sequences which are "unique to at least one of the new subtypes" listed in claim 75, or polypeptides encoded thereby. The specification does not set forth what makes a sequence unique to any given subtype beyond the specific sequences set forth in the specification, nor would one of skill in the art readily be able to ascertain such sequences. There is no known or disclosed attribute of an HCV sequence that makes any particular sequence or part thereof "unique to a subtype" on its face. The decision for subtyping a new sequence within a type or subtype is based on a complex assessment of sequence homology and/or divergence in various places in the more than 9Kb of genomic material for HCV. Further, there is no description of unknown sequences which may in the future be subtyped into one of the recited classes. Merely identifying a new subtype does not provide a specific written description of all the members which may fall within it in the future.

Art Unit: 1631

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, 3, 5 etc. odd numbers to 105, and sequences encoding SEQ ID NO: 107-207 which correspond to specific HCV sequences that fall within certain subtypes of HCV. Claims directed to these specific SEQ ID NO's would meet the written description provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, claim 75 is directed to encompass gene sequences, sequences that hybridize to the recited SEQ ID NO's, sequences "unique to a subtype", "a part of a sequence that is unique" etc. **None** of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of the specific sequences recited above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides and/or proteins, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is

Art Unit: 1631

claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

Therefore, only the specific sequences recited above, but not the full breadth of the claim meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Claims 75-85 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for the reasons set forth in the previous office action.

Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not completely persuasive.

The metes and bounds of the phrase "sequence which is unique to at least one of the new HCV Types... or one of the subtypes" in claims 75-79, 81, and 85 are unclear. The specification

Art Unit: 1631

does not set forth what makes any given nucleic acid or peptide sequence unique to a type or subtype. In regards to arguments regarding previously allowed claims, Applicant is reminded that the case was reopened for prosecution, and all applications are examined under present policy and guidelines. In regards to the arguments regarding the various guidelines in the specification for determining uniqueness, these limitations are not a part of the pending claims, and such limitations from the specification cannot be read into the claims.

Further, the metes and bounds of the phrase “or a part of a sequence which is unique...” are unclear. How much of a sequences is required to be a part? Must the whole “part” be unique? Is the whole unique portion required in the “part”? or does the claim merely require a single nucleotide as a part of a sequence? The specification is not enlightening in this regard.

Applicant’s arguments do not address how much of a part is required. The arguments suggest that only 5 nucleotides “may” be a part, but not that any particular minimum is a requirement.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary K Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0723.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached at (571) 272-0722.

The Official fax number for this Art Unit is: (703) 872-9306

Application/Control Number: 08/836,075


Page 6

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC1600 Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

mkz

2/27/04

  
MARY K. ZEMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

